Office - Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
OCT 28 1982
ALEXANDER L. STEVAS,
CLERK

82-764

NUMBER_____

IN THE

SUPREME COURT of the UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM 1982

CHARLOTTE L. WHITE and
WENDELL L. WHITE,

PETITIONERS,

Versus

COMMISSIONER of INTERNAL REVENUE

RESPONDENT.

PETITION for Writ of CERTIORARI

APPENDIX of LOWER COURT DECISIONS.

WENDELL L. WHITE
PETITIONER
225 South "F" ST.
OXNARD, CALIF. 93030
tel. (805) 483-1950

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Petition for Writ of Certiorari	29
Appendix of Lower court decisions	33
Short rebuttal by Wendell White	56
Questions for review	viii

Prelude: Wendell White asked all his sons if they wanted to go to school. They all had gone to kindergarten, so knew of its styling. They all were tole their father would back up the secision they made. the first three opted to go to school. The fourth, Tim, knew how to read and opted to stay out of school until his father was threatened with jail, whence he said he wanted to go. Presently there is sufficient technology to have education in the home to adequate and greater level than that available in classrooms in public schools.

Sincerely Wendell L. White

TABLE OF CITATIONS

	Page
United States Constitution	
Article 1, section 2, clause 3	31
" 1, " 10, " 1	55
AMENDMENT 2	30-45
" 3	51
" 7	56-60
" 13	31-51
" 16	56
Federal Rules of Appeal p/38	35
Congressional Law 26 USC 1232	32
TAX COURT RULE 150	29
Income Tax Reg. Sec. 1.162-5(b)(3)	56
Rev. Proc. 74-23, 1974-2 C.B. 476	54
" " 77-40, 1977-2 C.B. 574	54
TAX COURT MEMO 1981-512	35
CASES	
Brushaber v. Union Pacific R.R. 240 US 1 (1916)	34
Burnstein v. Comm. 66 TC 492(1976)	51
Cohan rule 39 F. 2d. 540, 543-544 (2d cir. 1930)	50
Comm. v. Duberstein, 363 US 278	33
Hatfield v. Comm, 68 TC 895(1977)	46
Lonsdale v. Comm. 661 F. 2d 71, 72 (5th Cir. 1980)	35

Cases, Con't. Page

McCoy v. Comm, 76 TC 1027 (1981) 46

Nyhus v. Comm, 594 F. 2d 1213, 1214-1215 (8th Cir. 1979) 46

Reinsinger v. Comm. 71 TC 568 (1979) 56

Tyree Realty Co. v. Anderson, 240 US 115 (1916) 34

U.S. v. Campbell, 619 F. 2d 765, 767 (Case obviously violates U.S. Constitution Art. III Sec. 2, cl 2)(8th Cir. 1980) 46

U.S. v. Hurd, 549 F. 2d 118 (9th Cir.1977) 34 (probably violates Art III Sec 2 Cl 3 U.S. Const)

U.S. v. Sibla, 624 F. 2d 864, 866, &n 1 (9th Cir. 1980)(Viol. Art III, sec. 2, cl.2.) 46

Weiszmann v. Comm. 52 TC 1106, 1110-1111, (1969) Affd. per curiam 443 F. 2d 29, (9th Cir. 1971) 56

WHITE V. COMM. TC 1183-80 29-35

WHITE V. COMM. 9th Cir. 81-7829 29-33

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

11. Is marriage for the convenience of the State, so it may attain the quartering of its soldiers against the insurrection of ignorance ?

12. Is Certiorari a review of Treason questions ?

PETITION for WRIT of CERTIORARI

Wendell L. White, hereby petitions the U.S. Supreme Court for certification of record from the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Judicial Circuit for its Case Number #81-7829 to review Federal Questions. (Tax Ct. #1183-80)

The error at law to be corrected is to substantial in nature as to make it manifest that Justice requires the Writ to issue to prevent a material wrong.

The 9th Circuit's refusal to vacate judgment is reviewable. Civil Rights are restraints on Government. The right to have a jury determine the amount in controversy $1877 is a right granted to be preserved by Amendment Seven, U.S. Constitution. Such right was refused in the U.S. Tax Court Case #1183-80.

Further the right of recording, Tax Ct. Rule 150 was denied petitioner, by force of

arms and numbers of people, a nullification of Amdnement Two, U.S. Constitution the right to keep and bear Arms (the right to have and use tools) Videotape being a tool for the recording and replay of sound and visual impressions for 6 hours in the case of the White machine.

Further; the amount in controversy was not just the amount sought by the Internal Revenue Service but the $200,000 sought for services to the Government by the White family as slaves, involuntary servants, mandated soldiers against the insurrection of ignorance. That was not even answered by the attorneys for the IRS or the Judge, Arnold Raum, they ignored that claim, and did not dispute such service, clearly making the claim one which should be paid. For the basis is well known and enforced, in spite of Constitutional guarantees. Federal Question of substantial manifest nature.

Unbelievable though it seem, the Constitution disclaims jurisdiction over any place where there is slavery or Involuntary servitude that is practices without conviction of crime, thus the attempting of collection of Federal Taxes upon such family that is encumbered by such slavery or involuntary servitude as might be foisted upon them, forcefully by government is not liable for Federal Taxes of any kind under the theory no juriediction no tax liabi - lity. (Amendment 13) Evidence testified to in U.S. TaxCourt showed such servitude.

Secondarily, Extorted people are not "Free" extortion being the force of government by "Arms" threat to persons or family members of such person threatened. Thus the Mandate of daily Education or the jailing of parents shows the White family not free, and thereby liable for only 3/5ths taxation. (Art. I, sec. 2. 3)

While not in the original return, the concept of deductions for the valuation of currency became part of the testimony and argument prior to the court filings. Such evaluation of the Federal Reserve Note currency is apparently allowed in 26 USC 1232, but was not allowed by the Commissioner. Constitutionally the "Inflation" is a proper Income Tax in our opinion. The evaluation was put forth in relation to pre- 16th amendment currency. and was found to be from 10 to 1,to,20 to one, most probable was used at about 15 to 1. However, for theGov't to write denominations on money and then not accept it at such stated demonimation for the purposes of taxes would be Fraud, However, the value is all it is worth to the user, consequently the taxation should be at the source valuation and paid by denomination statement. That to protect the 9th Amendment right of non-disparagement.

APPENDIX of LOWER COURT DECISIONS

United States Court of Appeals, for the Ninth Circuit, Filed Aug. 9, 1982, ORDER #81-7829

Before: Barnes, Wright and Poole, Circuit Judges.

Appellants' petition for rehearinf has been considered and denied.

Filed; Aug. 9, 1982 # 81-7829 MEMORANDUM Submitted June 22, 1982, before : Barnes, Wright and Poole, Circuit Judges.

The members of the panel have unanimously agreed that this appeal is appropriate for submission without oral argument, It is so ordered.

The Tax Court's determination that appellants were not entitled to itemized deductions in excess of the amounts allowed by the Commissioner is not clearly erroneous, See Commissioner vs. Duberstein, 363 U.S. 278, 289-91 (1960). *1 page 34

Appellants' further arguments are frivolous. Both the federal income tax and the federal monetary system are constitutional. Brushaber v. Union Pacific R.R., 240 U.S. 1 (1916); Tyree Realty Co. v. Anderson, 240 U.S. 115 (1916); United States v. Hurd, 549 F.2d 118 (9th Cir. 1977).

Appellants had no constitutional right to a jury trial in the Tax Court, Dahl v. Commissioner, 526 F.2d 522 (9th Cir. 1975). The assertion that the Tax Court judge committed treason in hearing the case is patently frivolous.

---

*1/ Appellants assert that "multiple hearings" are necessary so that the court fully understand their claims. We disagree.

Appellants have not addressed the merits of the Tax Court decision on appeal. Instead, they have elected to advance arguments that are patently without merit. Double costs on appeal are therefore awarded pursuant to Fed. R. App.

p. 38. See Lonsdale v. Commissioner, 661 F. 2d 71, 72 (5th Cir. 1981).

AFFIRMED.

UNITED STATES TAX COURT, # 1183-80 Filed September 15, 1981. Charlotte L. White, and Wendell L White, pro se. T. C. Memo. 1981-512 Jordon P. Weiss, for the respondent.

MEMORANDUM FINDINGS OF FACE AND OPINION. RAUM JUDGE: The Commissioner determined a $1, 943 deficiency in petitioners' income tax. At issue is the correctness of the Commissioner's disallownace of a number of itemized deductions calimed on petitioners, jointreturn. Petitioners' principal attack on the deficiency, however, is a constitutional challenge, variously stated, to the entire Federal income tax and the conduct of litigation in this Court relating thereto.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Petitinners, husband and wife, were residents of California when they filed their petition in this Court. They filed a joint Federal income tax return for 1977. In petitioners' return, the husband's occupation was stated to be "Industrial Engr." and the wife's "Reg. Nurse". The income reported consisted of three items: The wife's wages in the amount of $16,484.85 for nursing services; net income in the amount of $2,019.97 recorded on Schedule E representing $2,962.68 net rentals ($8,275.15 gross minus $5,312.47 expenses) received from three rental properties minus a $342.71 net loss ($171.75 gross receipts[1] minus $514.16 expenses) on a "Chicken Business" not otherwise identified; and a minor item of $5 described only as "Found."[2]

1. Although Schedule E is showed gross receipts of $171.75, petitioners used $171.45

in computing the net loss.

2. Three other minor items of income were reported not as "income", but as negative amounts under miscellaneous deductions, See note 5, infra.

No income appears to have been reported from any activity of the husband which could be characterized as that of an "industrial engineer". The Government does not contend that petitioners received any unreported income.

In the notice of deficiency the Commissioner did not disallow any of the deductions claimed in Schedule E in respect of rental properties, but he did disallow $324 as a "Chicken business" loss. Accordingly, there is no issue either as to the gross receipts from the rental properties ($8,275.15) and gross receipts from the "chicken business" ($171.75) reported in Schedule E, or as to the deductions claimed therein in respect

of those items. The only matter in dispute relates to itemized deductions claimed on petitioners' return.

The total amount of itemized deductions claimed in Schedule A of the return was $14,440.61.[4] By taking into account these deductions and the five claimed exemptions (two petitioners plus three for dependent children), the return showed the amount of tax to be "None".

---

*3. It is clear from the language used in the deficiency notice that the Commissioner intended to disallow the entire loss claimed ($342.71), but the disallowed amount was stated to be $324, obviously eliminating the $.71 cents and erroneously reversing the last two digits in the dollar amount.

*4. From this amount there was subtracted $3,200, the "zero bracket" amount, which has already been taken into account in the tax tables, leaving an "Excess itemized deductions" in the amount of $11,240.61.

The summary of itemized deductions claimed

in Schedule A was as follows:

Medical & Dental Expenses	$1,429.70
Taxes	3,201.61
Contributions	3,821.96
Miscellaneous	5,987.34
Total	$14,440.61

In the notice of deficiency petitioners were allowed a deduction of $1,440 for Medical expenses, thereby eliminating that item as a matter of controversy. However, the Commissioner allowed a deduction in the amount of only $491 for taxes and only $821 for contributions. Petitioners have failed to prove they made expenditures in excess of those two amounts for the respective purposes.

The handwritten entries in Schedule A of the return purporting to list the components of the $5,987.34 miscellaneous deductions are confusing. One component appears to be for $2,000 for "Engineering" expenses. The record fails to show either that there were any

"engineering" activities to which this component might relate or even if there were any such activities they would qualify, in the circumstances of this case, as a business or profession or as a profit oriented venture of either petitioner, or that any expenditures were in fact made that might conceivably be classified as engineering expenses in respect of this item or any other item. At the trial, Mr . White stated without further explaination that this item "goes to a thing called the "HitVan" Business, and that is a loan of $2,000 to our son for the "Hit Van" business that--".

Two other miscellaneous seductions claimed in Schedule A were"Nursing Business Expenses" in the amount of $2,179.16 and "Demanded Schooling" in the amount of $2,452.85[5]. Although there was reason to believe that the latter item pertained to the compulsory school attendance

#5 on #1

of petitioners' children, Mr. White stated at the trial that it, like the nursing business expenses, related to Mrs. White's occupation as a registered nurse.

During 1977, and for a number of years prior thereto, Mrs. White worked as a registered nurse at St. John's Hospital in Oxnard, Calif. She did not have a college degree, but in addition to performing nursing services she from time to time did relief or substitute work at the hospital in managerial or supervisory capacity. It was indicated to her that, although she was

*5/ The sum of the foregoingthree claimed miscellaneous deductions ($2,000 Engineering expenses, $2,179.16 Nursing expenses, and $2,452.85 Demanded Schooling) exceeds the $5,987.34 total miscellaneous expenses claimed. However, the difference is explained by three "negative" deductions which were confusingly recorded under "Miscellaneous Deductions" and which Mr. White explained at the trial represented income. They are $24 relating to "Boat & Car", $475.67 relating to "Secretarial Business", and $145 relating to "225 Rental". These three "negative" items are not in issue.

not required to do so, it would be advisable to take college courses in management. In addition, she was required to take courses in continuing education related to her nursing work;but to qualify for continuing education credit the course must be registered with the so-called Board of Nursing Education and certified by that Board that it related to the student's work as a nurse. During 1977 Mrs . White was enrolled in a collete taking courses which ultimately led to her obtaining a degree for Bachelor of Science in Management in 1978, Only some of the courses taken in 1977 qualified for continuing education credit, and the record does not satis-- factorily established what percentage of the courses taken did in fact so qualify.

The degree which Mrs. White received in 1978 entitled her to serve in a managerial position, although she had previously done so in a relief

or acting capacity at her hospital. Also, there are other hospitals in which she would not have been employed in a managerial capacity without the degree.

The college in which Mrs. White was enrolled was 32 miles from her home and she attended classes there twice a week throughout the year commuting by automobile. She paid $1,291 for her tuition and $21 for books during 1977. In the notice of deficiency the Commissioner allowed deductions in respect of Mr. White's employment as a registered nurse as follows:

Transportation related to educational expenses	$673
Education	594
Uniforms	274
	$ 1,541

OPINION

Although the major portion of the reported income had its source in Mrs. White, the litigation appears to have been dominated on petit-

ioners' behalf by Mr. White. He conducted the trial for petitioners, and he alone signed most of the papers, motions, and other documents submitted to the Court at various stages of the case. Throughout his presentation, particularly in the documentary materials, there is a vigorous -- indeed a zealous or even pationate -- condemnation of the Federal income tax on a sweeping constitutional grounds, many of which are impossible to restate in clearly intelligible terms. He has also attacked the part that the Federal Reserve Notes play in our money system, and has challenged the right, under the Constitution, of the Court to adjudicate this case. Indeed, in the latter respect he has stated that any judge who thus "accepts jurisdiction*** will or has admitted Treachery to (sic) Treason*!" and further that "upon admission of treason in open court a sentence of Death or whatever other

punishment the Congress has passed shall accrue!" And it may fairly be inferred from the materials filed by him that he regarded the very action of a judge presiding at the trial in open court as potentially an admission of treason. [6] His opening

*6/ Among the constitutional arguments made by Mr. White is a contention based on the 2nd Amendment ("Right to Keep and Use Arms (tools)"). He contends that such right was infringed when the Deputy Clerk and a United States Marshal required him to remove from the courtroom videotape and recording equipment which he had brought with him in an apparent attempt to establish that the trial of his case in this Court constituted treason.

brief does not address on the merits any issue that is presented by the Commissioner's adjustments, but is devoted to extensive and confused elaboration of the foregoing constitutional and related matters. His reply brief undertakes, for the first time, to argue the merits of the Commissioner's adjustments, but such argument by a lengthy and confusing discussion of his so-called constitutional contentions. And

even the discussion of the merits is extensevely interlaced with Mr. White's constitutional and related arguments. Such arguments are of a type which the courts have repeatedly rejected and characterized as frivolous; they do not warrant further discussion. See, e.g., United States v. Sibla, 624 F. 2d 864, 866, & n.1 (9th Cir. 1980); United States v. Campbell, 619 F. 2d 765, 767 (8th Cir. 1980); McCoy v. Commissioner, 76 T.C. 1027 (1981): Hatfield, v. Commissioner, 68 T.C. 895, 899-900 (1977): cf. Nyhus v. Commissioner, 594 F. 2d 1213, 1214-1215 (8th Cir. 1979). We therefore turn at once to the matters presented by the deficiency notice, which we must consider, since, unlike many or most so-called tax protesters, petitioner did in fact undertake to present some evidence relating to the deductions in issue.

(a) Medical expenses and chicken business

loss. Neither of these adjustments is now in issue since, as to the former, the Commissioner has allowed a somewhat greater deduction than that claimec by petitioners, and, as to the latter, the Commissioner has conceded at the trial and on brief the deductibility of the chicken business loss.

(b) Taxes. Petitioners claimed on their return a total of $3.201.61 of deductible taxes paid in 1977. No evidence whatever was presented as to actual payments made during the year. The Commissioner has allowed a total of $491 in deductible taxes for the year. Government counsel explained at the trial that the $491 thus allowed consisted of $78 gasoline taxes, $6 motor vehicle taxes, $293 sales taxes, and $114 state income taxes. Petitioners have not proven thet they are entitled to any deductions for taxes paid in 1977 in excess of these amounts.

Mr. White's attempt to include among deductible taxes an item described as "3/4ths car expenses" in the amount of $2,240.81 was utterly bewildering. His attempt to justify the deduction of several other smaller components of the "Taxes" item was equally unconvincing. The record before us soes not warrant approving a deduction for taxes in excess of what the Commissioner has allowed.

(c) Charitable Contributions. Petitioners claimed charitable deductions in the aggregate amount of $3,821.96 No cancled checks or receiots or any other documentation(with the single exception of a statement from the First Presbyterian Church which will be commented upon shortly) [7] were offered in evidence to support the claimed deduction. However, on the basis

*7/ Although Mr. White stated at the trial, and reiterated in the reply brief, that he had a bag of evidence (receipts) brought to court for reference", the only documentation offered in evidence with respect to charitable contributions or any other claimed deduction

was the abovementioned statement from the First Presbyterian Church.

of the evidence we are satisfied that petitioners did contribute $189 to St. John's Hospital, which was withheld by the hospital from Mrs. White's wages. And, although we are less sure of the matter, we are prepared to find that petitioners contributed $182 to the First Presbyterian Church. We arrive at this conclusion on the basis of the only exhibit offered into evidence by petitioners, which was strenuously objected to by Government counsel. That (unsigned) exhibit contains typewritten entries showing actual payments in amount of $182. This is far cry from the sum of $907 which petitioners claim to have contributed to the church in 1977.

The evidence as to other claimed contributions totalling $250 to "Americans For Constitunal Taxation" raises the question not only

whether the alleged donations were in fact made but also whether the donee was an exempt organization. We could not, on the basis of the record before us, answer either of those questions in the affirmative. While it is true that we could probably find, without great confidence, on the basis of testimony that some additional, comparatively small contributions were made to qualifying institutions, we could not in any event arrive at a total amount of charitable contributions exceeding the $821 which the Commissioner allowed. Obviously, the Commissioner made a generous application of the Cohan rule (39 F. 2d 540, 543-544 (2d Cir. 1930)). Petitioners have not established that they are entitled to charitable deductions in excess of that amount.

(d) Nursing Business expenses and "demanded schooling". Although, as indicated in our findings. the deduction claimed on the return for

"demanded schooling" may have been intended to relate to his children's compulsory school attendance,[8] Mr. White stated flatly at the trial that this item pertained to Mrs. White's educational expenses. We accordingly consider it together with her nursing business expenses.

---

*8/ There is a strong inference based not only on the pleadings but also on other papers filed in this case (as well as on parts of the transcript) that the claimed deduction for "demanded schooling" related at least in part to the compulsory school attendance of petitioners' children. The third assignment of error set forth in the petition reads as follows:

> c. Educational expenses and transportation items demanded by state and quasi state demand of slavery and quasi slavery to the battle of the insurrection of ignorance engaged in by "States".

In the facts alleged in support of the assignments of error reference was made to the State of California's "demanded daily classroom attendance". And in petitioner's Reply to Respondent's Answer there were allegations indicating that students forced by the state to attend school were "quasi soldiers" and that the Third Amendment to the Constitution requiring "quartering pay for soldiers" was applicable. Further allegations suggest that the Thirteenth Amendment relating to involuntary servitude was also applicable. These confusing positions were

reiterated in one form or another in various other parts of the record. Moreover, Mr. White called his youngest son (Tim) to the witness stand who testified that although he wanted to go to school he was prevented from doing so by his father, and that he ultimately went to school only after legal proceedings were brought against the father by local authorities threatened the father with incarceration. (Wendell White Note, Gov't by Extortion) We were saddened to hear such testimony from an obviously unwilling witness, particularly when the lad broke into tears. Mr. White pursued the matter further when he called his wife as a witness and obtained testimony that there had been a trial in which it was stated that the boy had to go to school or the father would be put in jail. Amd he later followed up this point by asking her about the expenses ("shelter, *** food and clothing") incurred in "quartering" the students, apparently in some fashion seeking to support his bizarre position based on the Third Amendment. When told by the Court that it failed to see how paying for the children's keep would be a deductible expense, Mr. White replied that the " Schooling was was demanded of the state under extortion of me". Moreover, in petitioners' reply brief the following appears;

> Educational Expenses, since the State demands Tim attend school under threat of imprisonment (extortion) his expenses should be deductible estimated at $200 per month or about $2,400 for 1977

To the extent that this outlandish position may still be in the case as it might apply to the deduction claimed for "demanded schooling", it would be an understatement to say that it is thoroughly without merit.

As detailed in our findings, Mrs. White was a retistered nurse, who, during the taxable year 1977, was enrolled in a college taking part-time courses leading to the degree of Bachelor of Science in Management which in fact she obtained in 1978. Some of the courses did relate to her work as a registered nurse and she was given credit therefor in connection with the continuing education requirements applicable to her as a registered nurse. However, other courses such as those involving personnel management and finance did not so qualify. Moreover, upon obtaining her degree Mrs.White became eligible for employment in a managerial capacity in come hospitals, notwithstanding that the degree may not have been indispensible at the hospital where she had previously worked.

The Commissioner attempted to allocate a portion of Mrs. White's educational expenses to

thosecourses that related to her duties as a registered nurse and to exclude from deduction that portion that was identified with the management aspects of her college program leading towards the degree. He thus allowed $594 (out of a total of $1,281 for tuition and $21 for books) as deductible educational expenses, and he further allowed a deduction of $673 for transportation related to such educational expenses. [9]

*9/ The evidence shows that throughout the year Mrs. White made two round trips a week of 32 miles each by automobile from her home to the college. The total mileage for the year was thus 3,328 miles. However, mileage allowable during 1977 was 17 cents per mile. Rev. Proc. 74-23, 1974-2 C.B. 476, as amended by Rev. Proc. 77-40, 1977-2 C.B. 574. Accordingly, the total amount allowed was $564.76. or some $107 less than the Commissioner allowed.

We cannot find on this record that the Commissioner erred in failing to allow any additional deductions in respect of Mrs. White's nursing activities or the educational expenses

connected therewith.[10] Indeed, it is even arguable that Mrs. White was not entitled to any deduction relating to her education expenses because her course of study led to a degree[11] qualifying her for a new trade or business, notwithstanding that some of that education was helpful to her in her then current work.

---

*10/ It is true that there was evidence that Mrs. White incurred $40 in expenses to attend a weekend conference or seminar relating to her nursing work, and we are satisfied as to the deductibility of that amount, However, it is more than offset by the excessive amount allowed by the Commissinner in respect of Mrs. White's educational transportation expenses relating to nursing activities, as set forth in the prededing footnote. We are satisfied that the Commissioner did not err in his determination as it affected the entire deduction for "nursing business expenses".

*11/ Another example of Mr. White's many fanciful and far-fetched positions in this case appears in an objection that he made to the Government counsel's questioning Mrs. White about the courses that she took to obtain her degree:

> MR. WHITE: Your Honor, I think this line of questioning is covered under Article I, section 10(sic) where the Government is not to take regard of titles of nobility. A degree is in essence a title of nobility, under the German style titles of nobility.

See section 1.162-5(b)(3), Income Tax Regs,; cf. Reisinger v. Commissioner, 71 T.C. 568, 574-577 (1979): Burnstein v. Commissioner, 66 T.C. 492 (1976); Weiszmann v. Commissioner, 52 TC 1106, 1110-1111 (1969), Affd. per curiam 443 F.2d 29 (9th Cir 1971). However, since the determination of deficiency was not predicated on this theory and the Commissioner in fact allowed the deduction of sime portion of these expenses, we do not address this possible issue.

(e) Other possible deductions. Although Mr. White made various contentions as to other possible deductinns, the evidence was so confusing asn unsatisfactory that we can not say that the Commissioner erred in refusing to allow deductions in excess of what he in fact allowed. The burden was upon petitioners and they have failed to carry it.

Decisions will be entered under Rule 155.

SHORT REBUTTAL BY Wendell White

The origination of the case was by me in the Tax Court, claiming we were taxed in body as well as money, Thus Judge erred in suggestion that "deductions for Demanded Schooling" was for children, the case was for wages for the children and their parents work for the State.

Thus only the reply would address the Commissioners claims.

The reading of cited cases showed Wendell White that the IRS takes liberties not in the cases. Careful reading supports the White case. As does careful reading of Constitution and Laws.

Treason was accomplished by Judge Raum judging the money amounts over $20, that is the Common law (judge made law) to be preserved in Amendment 7. Judges should not decide money amounts, case shows he was obviously confused as to several points, presiding enough.

While the "English"of Judge Raum is much better than that of Wendell White, his understanding of the meanings of Mr. White is in gross error. Then that misrepresentation is backed up by Judges Barnes, Wright and Poole, who were asked to provide a vocal hearing becasue of the misrepresentation . and liable presented by Judge Raum.

As a father of high Intelligence Quotient children, the attempt to downgrade the meaning of Mr. White's readings of law and Constitutions can not be maintained in a personi confrontation They have prejudicially written what they wish others to perceive as the force of Mr. White's ideas, wrongly, and with apparent malice to agrandize their positions. Clearly the 16th Amendment is part of the Constitut ion, and thus the allegation that Wendell says the Income Tax is Unconstitutional is a false statement.

The evidence, fact and law were happily ignored by Judge Raum. He ignored the daily record evidence in contributions (while noting a $5 item listed as "Fount") in the income. The facts testified to by Mr. White, were that he had given in open plate collections much of the disallowed contributions (he not having a checking account). That some rental and other item donations were accounted for in the Contributions, and that the labor given was not counted but circled in the daily record, otherwise the "Contributions" would have been well over $5,000. The law is that in controversies over $20 a Jury should decide. A jury of peers, those knowing the White's activities would likely have credited them with the whole amount claimed. And remembered the slave and involuntary servitude service and awarded them cash or credits, for they would know well the amount of time effort and energy put into such.

Apparently the Government, as represented by the IRS and the judges, is affraid to face up to the fact that the value of the income of the White family, if represented by 1908 (BEFORE FRN INFLATION) Dollars would be about $1,294.50, and thus not taxable at all, particularly if deductions would be taken and a minus amount would be if exemptions alone were taken.

Thus the use of Judges to hear and decide the amounts is treacherous, by force Treason.

For, Common law is judge made law, and thus jury dedicable by amendment 7.

The Videotape would have shown the totality of the hearing, and that readily available, that was the reason for such record by W. White.

Certainly a jury trial so as to amount should be granted.

Sincerely, Wendell L. White

WENDELL L. WHITE
PETITIONER
225 South "F" ST.
OXNARD, CALIF. 93030
tel (805) 483-1950